



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,236	02/13/2001	Robert J. Greenberg	S133-USA	1573

28284 7590 07/25/2003

SECOND SIGHT, LLC
12744 SAN FERNANDO ROAD
BUILDING #3
SYLMAR, CA 91342

EXAMINER

EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3762

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/783,236

Applicant(s)

GREENBERG ET AL. CS

Examiner

George R Evanisko

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 11-16, 18-30, 34-36, 38-40, 48 and 50-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 11-16, 18-30, 34-36, 38-40, 48, 50-65 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-4, 29, 30, 35, 36, 38-40, 50, 52-55, and 57-61, drawn to an electrode array body, classified in class 607, subclass 141.
- II. Claims 21, 11-15, 20, 22, 25, 26, and 51, drawn to an electrode array body, classified in class 607, subclass 141.
- III. Claim 48, drawn to a retinal electrode array system, classified in class 607, subclass 53.
- IV. Claims 56, 18, and 19, drawn to an electrode array, classified in class 607, subclass 115.
- V. Claims 62-65, drawn to a retinal prosthesis, classified in class 607, subclass 54.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions III (combination) and I, II, IV and V are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require a flexible body having a curved shape in multiple dimensions, the strain relief slot defining a strain relief internal tab, at least part of the edge of the flexible body being more flexible than the center, the reinforced mounting aperture being suitable for attaching, the radius decreasing to eliminate

Art Unit: 3762

stress concentrations in the retina from contact with the flexible body, or the electronics package suitable to be affixed remote from the array body. The subcombination has separate utility such as an electrode array not requiring a reinforcing ring surrounding a reinforced aperture for a tack, but an array using a reinforced aperture for the tack.

Inventions V (combination) and I, II, and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require a flexible body having a curved shape in multiple dimensions, the strain relief slot defining a strain relief internal tab, at least part of the edge of the flexible body being more flexible than the center, the reinforced mounting aperture being suitable for attaching, or the radius decreasing to eliminate stress concentrations in the retina from contact with the flexible body. The subcombination has separate utility such as an electrode array not requiring the electronics to be remote from the array body, but being attached to the array body.

Inventions IV (combination) and I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require a flexible body having a curved shape in

Art Unit: 3762

multiple dimensions, the strain relief slot defining a strain relief internal tab, at least part of the edge of the flexible body being more flexible than the center, or the radius decreasing to eliminate stress concentrations in the retina from contact with the flexible body. The subcombination has separate utility such as an electrode array not requiring at least one reinforced mounting aperture in the body for attaching with a tack, but by using pressure similar to how a contact lens attaches to the eye to attach the electrode array.

Inventions II and I are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require a flexible body having a curved shape in multiple dimensions, at least part of the edge of the flexible body being more flexible than the center, or the radius decreasing to eliminate stress concentrations in the retina from contact with the flexible body. The subcombination has separate utility such as an electrode body not requiring a strain relief slot which defines a tab, but by using pressure similar to how a contact lens attaches to the eye to attach the electrode array.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

IN ADDITION, A SPECIES MUST BE CHOSEN

Art Unit: 3762

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Embodiments 1-3 of the flexible body electrode array having: a curved shape in multiple dimensions; an edge more flexible than the center; and the radius decreasing near edges of the body to eliminate stress concentrations, respectively

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, there are no claims that are allowable and generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 3762

A telephone call was made to Scott Dunbar on 7/22/03 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R Evanisko whose telephone number is 703 308-2612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 703 308-5181. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 306-4520 for regular communications and 703 306-4520 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1148.

GRE
July 22, 2003

GEORGE R. EVANISKO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/22/3